



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,648	05/09/2006	Holger R. Scholl	DE 030373	1808
24737 7590 07/11/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, QUYNH H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/578,648

Applicant(s)

SCHOLL ET AL.

Examiner

QUYNH H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-12 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/9/06 was received. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaffer et al. (2002/0108113).

As to claims 1 and 13, Schaffer teaches a system and method for program recommendation comprising the steps of: accessing program information ([0072]) where the program information comprises a plurality of broadcast channels, a broadcast time of content pieces broadcast at the channels, and a content description of the content pieces ([0029] - [0030], [0035], [0063]); calculating for a plurality of content pieces a piece score, the piece score indicating a match of the content description with a profile ([0028], [0036], [0053]); determining a plurality of sequences of content pieces, where the content pieces contained in the sequences are broadcast consecutively at the

channels ([0034] - [0035]); calculating for the sequences a sequence score, based at least on the pieces scores of pieces contained in the sequence and on a correlation of the content descriptions of at least two of the pieces contained in the sequence ([0028], [0036], [0053]); and selecting at least one of the sequences according to the sequence score ([0038], [0056]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffer et al. (2002/0108113)) in view of Pachet et al. (EP1170722 A).

As to claim 2, Schaffer does not explicitly teach selection means are configured to calculate the sequence score according to one or more rules and the sequence score is calculated from the pieces score and the correlation values.

Pachet teaches selection means are configured to calculate the sequence score according to one or more rules and the sequence score is calculated from the pieces score and the correlation values ([0070] - [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Pachet into the teachings of

Schaffer in order to have a more efficient system and resulting better sequence score and correlation values.

As to claims 3-5 and 7, Pachet teaches the selection means are configured to calculate the path score such that it is lower the more switchovers from a first content piece of the sequence to a second content piece, if two or more content pieces in a sequence are of a common type or does not contain content pieces of predetermined type ([0042] - [0044]).

As to claim 6, Pachet teaches the selection means are configured to pre-select a number of sequence based on the piece scores of the content pieces of the sequences, and calculate path scores only for the pre-select sequences ([0043] - [0048]).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 8-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claim 8, prior arts of record fail to teach, or render obvious, alone or in combination, a system for program recommendation comprising the claimed means and their components, relationships, and functionalities as specifically recited in claims 8 and independent claim 1 that claim 8 depends on.

Claims 9-12 are objected because they depend on objected claim 8.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Quynh H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614